A STUDY OF E.M. FORSTER

— His Ideal Human Relationship —

KAZUKO OTSUKA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction His Opinion on Art and His Theme

Edward Morgan Forster can be said to have maintained, with some qualification, the ideal of "Art for Art's Sake," though he lived through an age of convulsions. He expresses his opinion in *Two Cheers for Democracy:*

> Works of art, in my opinion, are the only objects in the material universe to possess internal order, and that is why, though I don't believe that only art matters, I do believe in Art for Art's Sake.[1]

In those days, the old sense of values and belief in the goodness of human nature had declined; science had made remarkable progress, and World War I broke out in 1914. People had " a sense of living

1. E. M. Forster, "Art for Art's Sake," *Two Cheers for Democracy*, Vol. XI of *The Abinger Edition of E. M. Forster*, ed. Oliver Stallybrass (London: Edward Arnold, 1972), p. 93.

between disaster and disaster."[1] The aims of art reflected this troubled background. Art was classified into two classes by Malcolm Bradbury:

> The aim [of art] can be culturally preservative: a desire to maintain the elitism and selectivity of the arts. Or it can be culturally subversive: the desire to disintegrate traditional culture, traditional expectation, all past norms.[2]

According to this classification, Forster had the desire to be preservative; he inherited the tradition of Jane Austen and George Eliot. In this he was not completely representative, for many of the writers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in England had the desire to be subversive. At that time, artists could not speak out unaffected by social conditions. They could not hold the "humanist view of art" any longer; most artists tried to keep up with the times. They were thus radical; at the same time, they were more concerned with the nation or with politics than with "Art for Art's Sake."

Forster, on the other hand, always hoped to realize the "humanist view of art." As Malcolm Bradbury explains:

> [The humanist] view of art [is] an art that [contains] and [lives] alongside man, enlarging his conduct and sympathies, testifying to his humanity, introducing him to sectors of the world of which he [has] no experience, serving as a secular and open-ended wisdom. . . . E. M. Forster . . . for instance.[3]

Looking at a society filled with movement, Forster did not endeavor to keep up with the times, but feared only that art might lose its original aim. He said, "How can man get into harmony with his surroundings when he is constantly altering them?"[4] Therefore, he was not radical but temperate; at the same time, he was more concerned with "Art for Art's Sake" than with the nation or politics. Forster may be considered to be a writer of definite opinions, and who searched for his own ideal in the midst of a convulsed society.

---

1. Malcolm Bradbury, *Possibilities: Essays on the State of the Novel* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 88.
2. Bradbury, *The Social Context of Modern English Literature* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), p. 121.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
4. Forster, "Art's Sake," p. 89.

Forster constantly searched for the ideal human relationship; this was the main theme of his works. In the late nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, "the contemporary world [was] too fragmentary." Many writers' task was to change "the fragmentation into a world of form,"[1] but because of this fragmentation, it was hard for writers of those days to succeed to earlier writers. In spite of this difficulty, Forster had dedicated himself to make the many fragmentations of life into a form. He "longed for a friend,"[2] longed to "connect" one with another[3] and to "bridge the gulf" between one and another.[4] In conclusion, he thought it most important to have affection in order to realize the ideal relationship:

> The only thing that cuts a little ice is affection or the possibility of affection. Whatever the political solution, that can surely do no harm. But it must be genuine affection and liking. It must not be exercised with any ulterior motive. It must be an expression of the common humanity. . . .[5]

Forster begins to consider the theme of his works, the ideal relations, with "The Story of a Panic," and continues it in his later works. In this paper, I'd like to study "The Story of a Panic," *Howards End*, and *A Passage to India*.

First, in "The Story of a Panic," Forster represents the impossibility of a close relationship between Mr Tytler and Eustace Robinson. Secondly, in *Howards End*, the compromised relationship between Margaret Schlegel and Henry Wilcox is shown. Lastly, in *A Passage to India*, Forster insists on the thwarting of the ultimate relationships between Adela Quested and Aziz. I am going to study Forster's ideal human relationship, focusing on these three relations.

---

1. Bradbury, *Social Context*, p. 126.
2. Forster, "The Story of a Panic," *Collected Short Stories* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1954), p. 31; hereafter cited as "Panic."
3. Forster, *Howards End*, Vol. IV of *The Abinger Edition of E. M. Forster*, ed. Oliver Stallybrass (London: Edward Arnold, 1973), p. 183; hereafter cited as *Howards End*.
4. Forster, *A Passage to India*, ed. Oliver Stallybrass (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979), p. 45; hereafter cited as *Passage*.
5. Forster, "India Again," *Two Cheers*, p. 323.

Chapter I The Impossibility of a Close Relationship in "The Story of a Panic"

In " The Story of a Panic," the relationship between Mr Tytler and Eustace Robinson proves impossible. Mr Tytler is a common Englishman whose world is based on reason, while Eustace is a spiritual boy whose world is beyond human understanding. The worlds they live in are completely divided, and so it is impossible for them to be close to each other.

Mr Tytler, the narrator, is a " plain, simple " British man who stays at a hotel in Ravello with his family; Ravello is an Italian town above which there is a valley.[1] In this hotel, he comes to know Eustace, Gennaro and several adults. Mr Tytler is a practical man who takes " the commercial side of " everything. For example, he says that it is " unreasonable to expect the proprietor to derive no income from his lands and so he approves of cutting down the trees.[2] He appreciates property more than natural beauty. Also, he gives money to Gennaro, " the stop-gap waiter " at the hotel, in order to make him fetch Eustace.[3] Although Gennaro, at first, refuses his order, he believes that he can change Gennaro's mind with money. He assumes the great influence of money on people's feelings. Mr Tytler thus appreciates material wealth more than mental wealth.

Eustace Robinson, on the other hand, is an impractical British boy of about fourteen. He neither plays hard nor works hard, loafing all day long; therefore, Mr Tytler and the other adults at the hotel criticize him, saying that " what he really [needs is] discipline."[4] However, Eustace does not follow their advice at all; he is always isolated, without joining them.

Eustace is, though, changed greatly by the " harassing and most

---

1. " Panic," p. 9.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

extraordinary" events which happen during a picnic in Vallone Fontana Caroso, the secluded valley above Ravello. This valley, "covered with leafy [chestnuts],"[1] generally seems to be "a many-fingered green hand, palm upwards."[2] Also, it is filled with silence; no sound except "a cat's-paw of wind" can be heard.[3] In this valley Pan, the Greek god, secretly lives.[4] This place, separated from daily life, is Pan's den, filled with wild nature and an absolute silence.

Mr Tytler, Eustace and the other adults go on a picnic to this valley. When Mr Tytler looks at the scene, he says that he is "thoroughly content" with the beautiful valley.[5] When he hears Eustace whistle, though, he feels that it is an "ear-splitting and discordant" sound. He fails to understand that the sound is for Pan, who is pleased by rural music.[6] Therefore, Mr Tytler can not notice that Pan is living in this valley. Moreover, he feels extremely anxious when he senses the "cat's-paw of wind," as do all the others except Eustace. John Sayre Martin says of this point:

> Their inability to cope with the wind signifies a spiritual failure. They cannot cope with it because . . . they have repressed their emotional and instinctive drives.[7]

Finally, Mr Tytler and all the other adults run away from the valley in panic, leaving only Eustace behind. They flee because "all the channels of sense and reason [are] blocked"; they feel "brutal, overmastering, physical fear."[8] Mr Tytler and all the others but Eustace are, that

---

1. "Panic," p. 10.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
4. Cf. "Pan," *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Vol. VII (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 412: Pan had "the head, arms, and chest of a man, while his lower parts were those of a *goat*. . . . [He was supposed] to delight in *rural music*; he was also regarded as the author of sudden and groundless terror seizing upon beasts or men (*Panic*). . . ." (Emphasis added).
5. "Panic," p. 11.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
7. John Sayre Martin, *E. M. Forster: The Endless Journey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 50.
8. "Panic," p. 15.

is, seized with " panic," for they lack spiritual perception.

On the contrary, Eustace does not feel fear. Rather, he feels happy in this secluded place. First, he makes a whistle, a Pan's pipe, out of a piece of wood.[1] Up to now, Eustace has been isolated and not been able to make friends. He thus sounds the whistle out of an unconscious longing for his friend, Pan. After waiting " with the irritable frown," he achieves his desire.[2] When he sees " some goat's footmarks," or Pan's footprints, " he [lies] down and [rolls] on them, as a dog rolls in dirt.[3] He finds Pan's existence and glimpses the glory of nature.

Immediately thereafter, Eustace is greatly changed. He does not loaf any longer, but acts manfully and proudly. Martin again explains this change:

> [Eustace] is drawn to worship ' Pan ' as an all embracing power. Only he appears to be saved from the emotionally inhibiting forces of adult life.[4]

This isolated valley—Pan's den—is very different from the world of daily life, where Mr Tytler and the other adults live; it is in Pan's world that Eustace eventually finds the home of his heart.

The universe is formed of two elements. One is what human beings can understand in daily life; it is symbolically represented by " the little clearing," where they have lunch.[5] Mr Tytler and the other adults are the part of this element, but Eustace cannot adapt himself to it. The other element is what man cannot notice in everyday life, what is usually beyond human understandng;it is symbolized by the valley secluded from the town, with its trees and water, with the hills around and the stars over head. Only Eustace can appreciate this element because he is rich in spirit. Also, he is lonely in the world of reason and longs for the home of his heart. The others, including Mr Tytler,

---

1. John Colmer, *E. M. Forster: The Personal Voice* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), p. 30.
2. " Panic," p. 13.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
4. J. S. Martin, p. 50.
5. " Panic," p. 16.

cannot know this world because they lack spiritual perception. In short, Eustace is spiritual, so he is able to sense the supernatural element of the universe.

Now, Mr Tytler, Eustace and the others come back to daily life, to the hotel. As soon as Eustace sees Gennaro, he dashes to Gennaro to tell him of his experience in the valley. Gennaro is "a poor Italian fisherboy,"[1] and his world is natural and primitive[2]; it is very close to what Eustace has appreciated in the valley. Consequently, he has an instinct for understanding Eustace's feelings and for sympathizing with him. On the other hand, Mr Tytler cannot understand their relationship because he is a common Englishman. "Solidity, caution, integrity, efficiency" and "[lack] of imagination"[3]—as Forster says in *Abinger Harvest*, these are typical British characteristics, and they describe Mr Tytler. Although both Mr Tytler and Eustace are English, their reactions to the experience in the valley are opposite. Mr Tytler is seized with a "panic," while Eustace finds the home of his heart there.

At midnight on the day of the picnic, Eustace slips away from his bedroom to the garden, which belongs to the supernatural element of the universe. He cannot stay in his room because it is "too small" for him; it belongs to the element of reason, being separated from the other element by "a stone wall."[4] In the garden, no matter how the others try to stop him, he insists on speaking "of the rain and the wind by which all things are changed, of the air through which all things live, and of the woods in which all things can be hidden." He now attempts "to tackle themes which the greatest poets have found almost beyond their power."[5] After his experience in the valley, Eustace finds the great world of nature and feels at home in it. However, he cannot

1. "Panic," p. 23.
2. Luigi Brazini, *The Italians*, Tetsuro Murofushi and Naoko Murofushi, trans. (Tokyo: Kohbundo, 1965), pp. 41–48.
3. Forster, "Notes on the English Character," *Abinger Harvest* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 13.
4. "Panic," p. 25.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

understand the world of common men's understanding. He says, " The trees, hills, stars, water, I can see all. But isn't it odd! I can't make out men a bit."[1]

Mr Tytler, conversely, cannot understand why Eustace hates his bedroom or why he wants to go out of the hotel. He tells Gennaro to fetch Eustace, saying that he will give money to Gennaro if he can bring Eustace back to him. Eustace is, then, fetched by Gennaro at the request of Mr Tytler. Because he has found his home in the vastness of nature, though, he cannot see anything of value in the limited room. When he is forced to stay in his small bedroom, he says that he " can see nothing at all " and sobs bitterly.[2] Finally, at the sacrifice of his life, Gennaro, the only boy who can understand Eustace's feelings, helps him run away from the room to the secluded valley. " [Far] down the valley towards the sea, there still [resounds] the shouts and the laughter of the escaping boy." Mr Tytler and the other adults can only listen to Eustace's laughter still incomprehensibly.[3]

Mr Tytler is a material and practical man, a typical British man. He lacks spiritual perception and fears the vast world beyond reason. On the contrary, Eustace is an impractical boy in daily life. However, he is rich in spirit and finds his home in the world which surpasses man's common understanding. The universe is constituted of two elements. One is within man's understanding, and the other is beyond it; Mr Tytler belongs to the former, while Eustace belongs to the latter. The result is that they cannot understand each other. Their close relationship is, therefore, absolutely impossible.

Chapter II The Compromised Relationship in *Howards Ena*

In *Howards End*, the relations between Margaret Schlegel and Henry Wilcox are achieved through Margaret's compromise. She loves him, and so she tolerates his demerits; thereby she can form a relationship with him.

---

1. " Panic," p. 29.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Margaret, the heroine, is a German-English woman who lives with her sister and brother—Helen and Tibby. Wickham Place, their house, is in London, the center of modern civilization. On the other hand, Henry is a pure Englishman who lives with his wife, Ruth, and two sons and one daughter in Howards End, a house on the outskirts of London.

Margaret is a middle-class intellectual woman who earnestly loves nature and art. For example, when she takes a walk in the garden, she plays " with the grass which [trickles] through her fingers like sand."[1] When she drives " her fingers through the grass," the hill " beneath her [moves] as if it [were] alive."[2] Margaret and nature are, then, united into one. In addition, she is able to appreciate art; in listening to music, for instance, she " can only see the music " without thinking of anything.[3] As Forster himself says, there are two sorts of music—one is " music that reminds [us] of something," while the other is " music itself." In order to judge rightly the value of music, we should listen to " music itself"[4]:

> [The] music which is untrammelled and untainted by reference is obviously the best sort of music to listen to; we get nearer the center of reality.[5]

Margaret is artistic, and so she understands the real worth of art.

Henry is a middle-class businessman who cannot love either nature and art. He has hay fever, " his chief objection against living," so that he has to " be shut up in the house " every summer.[6] Moreover, he coolly criticizes art, describing "Art and Literature, except when conducive to strengthening the character," as " nonsense."[7] Margaret's attitude to nature and art is thus completely different from Henry's; Margaret can unite with nature and art, while Henry cannot do so at

---

1. *Howards End*, p. 245.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 331.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
4. Forster, " Not Listening to Music," *Two Cheers*, p. 122.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
6. *Howards End*, p. 334.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 21.

all.

Margaret's opinion of modern civilization is distinct from Henry's, too. Modern society is always filled with movement; people change not only their circumstances, but also their sense of values. The Schlegels, for instance, have to move from Wickham Place, where they have been born and brought up. Margaret feels uneasy because she thinks that she must drift around "the civilization of luggage"[1] without any roots:

> I hate this continual flux of London. It is an epitome of us at our worst—eternal formlessness; all the qualities, good, bad and indifferent, streaming away —streaming, streaming for ever. That's why I dread it so.[2]

She earnestly wishes to "rest on the earth," to live in peace and quiet. Although the shadow of civilization approaches nearer to her moment by moment, she does not give up hoping:

> This craze for motion has only set in during the last hundred years. It may be followed by a civilization that won't be a movement, because it will rest on the earth. All the signs are against it now, but I can't help hoping. . . .[3]

Margaret disapproves of modern civilization for its continuous change and movement; she desires a deep-rooted society.

On the contrary, Henry approves of modern civilized society. This is because he can make a great profit as a company manager. As John Sayre Martin says, he is one of those imperialists who have contributed to England's "prosperity" by turning the cities into "commercial nightmares."[4] He lives "for the five minutes that have passed, and the five to come"; he has "the business mind."[5] Margaret's feelings toward civilization are completely the opposite to Henry's; Margaret feels uneasy, while Henry feels happy.

There are many differences in their attitudes toward nature, art and modern civilization. Margaret loves nature and art, and is uneasy

---

1. *Howards End*, p. 146.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 337.
4. J. S. Martin, pp. 115–116.
5. *Howards End*, p. 245.

when she looks at the civilized society; she is spiritual, just like Eustace in "The Story of a Panic." Conversely, Henry does not appreciate nature and art, feeling it pleasant to live in modern civilization; he is materialistic like Mr Tytler. In summary, it seems impossible to "connect" Margaret with Henry, just as it was impossible to unite Eustace with Mr Tytler.[1] The worlds they live in are distinct from each other's; Margaret's world is mental and spiritual, while Henry's is material and practical.

For all the differences between Margaret's world and Henry's, however, Margaret comes to be friends with his wife, Ruth Wilcox, after the Wilcoxes move from Howards End to London. At first, Margaret avoids associating with Ruth because she thinks that the Schlegels should keep their distance from the Wilcoxes for Helen's sake. (Helen has had an unsuccessful affair with Paul, the Wilcox's younger son.) The two families are so different that Helen has been "fascinated," picturing "new images of beauty in her responsive mind"; she loves not an individual but a whole family.[2] On the contrary, Margaret thinks that it is undesirable for the Schlegels to "connect" with the Wilcoxes—that is, a family of an absolutely different kind.

Margaret, however, is gradually attracted by Ruth. She gives "the idea of greatness" to Margaret[3] and seems to be near "the line that divides daily life from a life that may be of greater importance."[4] Unlike the other Wilcoxes, she is a spiritual woman who penetrates "the unseen" or the inner life.[5] While talking with her, Margaret vaguely understands true human relations. She says to Ruth:

> Life's very difficult and full of surprises. . . . It's then that proportion comes in—to live by proportion. Don't *begin* with proportion. Only prigs do that. Let proportion come in as a last resource. . . .[6]

---

1. *Howards End*, p. 183.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

Hearing her opinion, Ruth comes to believe that it is Margaret who can take over her spirit. Margaret and Ruth come to be united because both of them value the mental world.

Ruth passes away without achieving her desire to invite Margaret to Howards End—the home of Ruth's heart as well as her property. When she drew up her will, however, she expressed a wish that the inheritor of Howards End would not be the other Wilcoxes but Margaret. Henry and the children get angry about her will and reject it. Even so, Margaret eventually gains Ruth's spirit, even though she cannot get her property. Margaret can, therefore, say to Helen:

> Don't brood too much . . . on the superiority of the unseen to the seen. It's true, but to brood on it is medieval. Our business is not to contrast the two, but to reconcile them.[1]

Ruth has revealed to Margaret that the universe is formed of two elements—" the seen " and " the unseen "—and that the two of them should not be contrasted. One has to tolerate the other; one has to compromise with the other.

After Ruth's death, Margaret comes to associate with the Wilcoxes because she knows what true human relations are like. She thinks that the Schlegels' world, or " the unseen," should not conflict with the Wilcoxes', " the seen." It is, then, possible for her and Henry to be gradually attracted by each other and to try to be united. In order to realize an ideal relationship with Henry, however, Margaret has to take three steps. The first step is to observe Henry's character and sense of values, the second is to analyze his merits and demerits, and the last is to adapt to him with affection.

First, Margaret observes Henry's character and sense of values. Henry's attitudes toward nature, art and civilization are absolutely opposed to those of Margaret. Moreover, he is a British businessman who is outwardly " cheerful, reliable and brave,"[2] with " no external

1. *Howards End*, pp. 101–102.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 183.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

hint of weakness."[3] However, "panic and emptiness" lie behind his proud figure.[4] Forster defined Henry's character in describing a typical Englishman in *Abinger Harvest*:

> [An Englishman] is afraid to feel. He has been taught at his public school that feeling is bad form. He must not express great joy or sorrow. . . . He must bottle up his emotions, or let them out only on a very special occasion.[1]

Henry is afraid of affection because he is excessively material and practical. To make up for his lack of spirit, he struggles "for possessions that money cannot buy" and desires "comradeship and affection."[2]

Secondly, Margaret analyzes his character; she finds not only weak points but also strong points in his personality. In addition, Margaret notices that she also has demerits as well as merits. An unsigned review of the novel *World* makes this clear:

> [The Wilcoxes are] British, unromantic, businesslike, banal, but essentially men of action; [the Schlegels are] a mixed race, full of ideals gleaned from art and literature, steeped in the poetry of life but blunderers in its prose—impulsive, yet dreamers. . . . [3]

Henry, as a Wilcox, cannot but feel he can work efficiently. On the contrary, Margaret, as a representative Schlegels, is spiritual but impractical. As to his demerits, she simply says, "I know all Mr Wilcox's faults."[4] On the other hand, as to his merits, she insists that "[a] nation who can produce men of that sort [of Henry] may well be proud. No wonder England has become an Empire."[5] Margaret concludes that Henry and she are indispensable to each other; Henry has to depend on Margaret's spiritualism, and Margaret must rely on Henry's practicality.

Lastly, Margaret adapts to him with affection. Facing the fact that there is a wide gulf between Henry as he is and Henry as she wishes

---

1. Forster, "English Character," *Abinger*, p. 15.
2. *Howards End*, p. 161.
3. *World*, review of December 20, 1910, reprinted in *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Philip Gardner (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973), p. 155.
4. *Howards End*, p. 171.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

him to be, Margaret can no longer cling to armchair theory. Paul R. Rivenberg describes her progress thus:

> [Margaret] is moving away from her role as [a] clever, idealistic commentator, to become a woman who can both comment and creatively work her ideals into the realities with which she must cope.[1]

Margaret finds out, for instance, that Henry has made Jacky Bast, a woman of the lower class, his mistress ten years before. What is worse, he causes Leonard Bast, Jacky's husband, to become unemployed; Leonard loses his job because of Henry's wrong advice. As a result, Henry pushes Mr and Mrs Bast to the depths of misery. However, Henry does not feel any responsibility at all. He says to Margaret:

> As civilization moves forward, the shoe is bound to pinch in places, and it's absurd to pretend that anyone is responsible personally.[2]

Margaret notices that Henry is a very selfish man who looks down on the lower classes; he does not think of their feelings.

Disappointed a hundred times, still she does not give up trying to connect with Henry. She loves him from the bottom of her heart and tries not to reform his character but to approve of him as he is, with deep affection:

> Her surface could always respond to his without contempt, though all her deeper being might be yearning to help him. She had abandoned any plan of action. Love is the best, and the more she let herself love him the more chance was there that he would set his soul in order.[3]

Margaret achieves her desire to have a deep relationship with Henry; she loves him and adapts herself to him. She tolerates his demerits; she compromises with him on his weak points.

After all, Margaret's efforts are rewarded; she succeeds in helping

---

1. Paul R. Rivenberg, " The Role of the Essayist-Commentator in ' Howards End ' ," *E. M. Forster: Centenary Revaluations*, Judith Scherer Herz and Robert K. Martin, eds. (London: The Macmillan Press, 1982), p. 173.
2. *Howards End*, p. 188.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 217.

Henry " to the building of the rainbow bridge that should connect the prose . . . with the passion."[1] In " The Story of a Panic," though Eustace can appreciate " the unseen," or the world beyond man's understanding, he cannot make use of that knowledge in order to be united with Mr Tytler. Compared with Margaret, Eustace lacks a strong will to do so. Richard Martin emphasizes the conditions indispensable for achieving ideal human relationships:

> [Forster] acknowledges that the search for reality, which must involve some form of personal intercourse, demands resoluteness of purpose and strength of will. . . .[2]

With a strong will, Margaret tries to connect " the unseen " with " the seen," thinking that her efforts will surely be rewarded. Her effort is connected with the fact that she is not, like Henry Wilcox, " English to the backbone " but German-English.[3] In her body, she succeeds in uniting two worlds—the English and the German world:

> Now she thought of . . . the two supreme nations, streams of whose life warmed her blood, but, mingling, had cooled her brain.[4]

Eustace does not have such multinationality; he can understand only " the unseen." Consequently, he is not able to have a strong will to be friendly with Mr Tytler. On the other hand, Margaret can firmly believe in the possibility of connecting the two sets of values, namely, " the unseen " and " the seen." Forster makes Margaret a multinational woman in order to imply that she can succeed in connecting " the seen " and " the unseen."

To " live by proportion," to tolerate others' demerits, and to compromise with others—with these attitudes, Margaret achieves a deep relationship with Henry. Forster emphasizes the importance of " tolerance " in order to realize the ideal human relationship:

---

1. *Howards End*, p. 183.
2. Richard Martin, *The Love that Failed: Ideal and Reality in the Writings of E. M. Forster* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), p. 121.
3. *Howards End*, p. 5.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 198.

> [Tolerance] is the only force which will enable different races and classes and interests to settle down together to the work of reconstruction.[1]

There are two reasons why Margaret comes to know how to succeed in uniting " the seen " and " the unseen." The first reason is her character; she is a spiritual woman with a strong will. The second is her acceptance of Ruth's spirit; Ruth reveals to Margaret what an ideal relationship is like. Margaret can finally connect with Henry because she compromises with him on his weak points. She thus succeeds in uniting " the seen " and " the unseen."

Chapter III The Ultimate Relationships in *A Passage to India*

In *A Passage to India*, ultimate truths hinder Adela Quested and Aziz in their attemps to form close relationships. Adela and Aziz try to overcome the eternal differences between the East and the West in order to be friendly with each other, but in vain. Under the present conditions, their friendship is unachievable. India itself tries to let them know that problem, saying, " No, not yet."[2]

Adela Quested, the heroine, is a young English woman who visits India with Mrs Moore, so as to decide whether or not she should marry Ronny Heaslop; Ronny, Mrs Moore's son, is a City Magistrate in India. Aziz, an Indian doctor, is a widower with two sons and a daughter.

Adela is a logical woman who believes that she can understand everything around her. When she comes to India, therefore, she thus wants " to see the *real* India " and desires to associate with the Indian people in order to comprehend their country.[3] Forster himself is not entirely sympathetic with Adela's rather naive desire. He comments on her phrase, " the real India," in *Two Cheers for Democracy*:

> I don't myself like the phrase " the real India." I suspect it. It always makes me prick up my ears. . . . " Real " is at the service of all schools of thought.[4]

---

1. Forster, " Tolerance," *Two Cheers*, p. 44.
2. *Passage*, p. 289.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
4. Forster, " India Again," *Two Cheers*, p. 316.

Adela thinks that she can theoretically understand India and the people; at the same time, she hates " mysteries " or incomprehensible phenomena.[1] John Sayre Martin writes of this attitude:

> [Adela] dislikes mystery, for mystery by definition baffles the rational understanding and violates her belief that everything is, in theory at least, comprehensible.[2]

Adela is confidently logical, and so she is sure of being able to determine what " the real India " is like.

Aziz, on the other hand, is not logical. Rather, he is an instinctive man who regards Moslemism as the home of his heart and who finds " what is deepest in [his] heart "[3] in poetry:

> Aziz liked to hear his religion praised. It soothed the surface of his mind, and allowed beautiful images to form beneath. . . . [He] recited a poem by Ghalib. . . . [A] poem should touch the hearer with a sense of his own weakness, and should institute some comparison between mankind and flowers.[4]

As a Muslim, Aziz absolutely obeys Allah and believes that all his life is divinely decided. He recognizes human limitations, so that he does not, like Adela, think that he can understand everything in the world. Man has no force in the face of God; *The Human Being in the Qoran*, a recent commentary on the Muslem thought, explains:

> [Human] beings enjoy a relative freedom which is confined to a specific domain within which they can either choose a prosperous or a disastrous future.[5]

Knowing man's limitations, Aziz cannot have a logical attitude toward life.

Moreover, Aziz says, "All men are my brothers."[6] This means that his view of human relationships also comes from Moslemic ways of

---

1. *Passage*, p. 79.
2. J. S. Martin, p. 144.
3. *Passage*, p. 243.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 107.
5. Morteza Mutahhari, *The Human Being in the Qoran*, trans. Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi, ed. Somayyeh Hossainmardi (Tehran: Ministry of Islamic Guidance, [1981?]), p. 44.
6. *Passage*, p. 118.

thinking, from the idea of a "common culture." *The Human Being in the Qoran*, again, gives details:

> [A] common culture is more effective than common race in the creation of unity and likeness among human beings. With cultural support, nationality would unite all "I's" to one "We". . . . Awareness of human beings is thus the consciousness of national culture, national character and the national "We." It is directed towards nature, attributes and distinctions characteristics of a given culture.[1]

It is necessary for Aziz to make all men his brothers in realizing a Moslemic "common culture." In summary, Adela interprets the world around her and human relations differently from Aziz; Adela interprets them logically, while Aziz does so spiritually.

In addition to their characters, there is a national gulf between Adela and Aziz; Adela is an English woman, but Aziz is an Indian. As Barbara Rosecrance points out, "Forster's careful discriminations" in the opening chapter "are microcosms of his developing thematic preoccupations"[2]; in other words, the striking distinctions between India and England are deliberately emphasized in this scene:

> In the bazaars . . . the inhabitants [seem to be made] of mud moving. So abased, so monotonous is everything that meets the eye, that when the Ganges comes down it might be expected to wash the excrescence back into the soil.[3]

Compared with the muddy and chaotic Indian bazaars, the English residences are all in order:

> [English residences are] sensibly planned, with a red-brick Club on its brow, and further back a grocer's and a cemetery, and the bungalows are disposed along roads that intersect at right angles. It has nothing hideous in it, and only the view is beautiful; it shares nothing with the city except the overarching sky.[4]

As presented symbolically in this first chapter, India is confused, while England is well-organized. The differences between these two countries are then presented in terms, for instance, of geological features

---

1. Mutahhari, *Human in the Qoran*, pp. 68–69.
2. Barbara Rosecrance, "'A Passage to India': The Dominant Voice," *Centenary Revaluations*, p. 238.
3. *Passage*, p. 29.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

and climate, politics and economics, and religion. Mr Tytler and Eustace in " The Story of a Panic," and Henry and Margaret in *Howards End* do not confront national distinctions because all of them are English or half-English people. Adela and Aziz, though, have to struggle with the national gap besides the differences in their characters.

First, England and India differ in their geological features and climate. England consists of mountainous districts and plains. People can look at " the grand scenery of the English Lakes " in the mountainous districts; they can also pleasantly live on the green plains.[1] On the other hand, although India has some plains along the Ganges, most of her land is waste and desert; the flat land is monotonous except for such hills with caves as the Marabar. Moreover, the English climate is generally comfortable to live in, while the Indian climate is often unpleasant. Richard Martin explains the Indian climate:

> In India night is not perfectly dark, wind is hard and leaves no freshness, the sun is not welcomed but seen as threatening, emotional response is out of all harmony with the event that calls it forth, proportion does not work.[2]

English natural features are thus pleasant, but those of India are unpleasantly deserted-like.

Secondly, English politics and economics are distinct from those of India, too. England is a wealthy state which is highly civilized; India is a part of the British Empire, and so she must submit to England politically and economically. In this story, one of the Anglo-Indian ladies proudly says that English people are " superior to everyone in India."[3] Conversely, Aziz seriously thinks that not " until [India] is a nation will her sons be treated with respect."[4] As they both agree, India is a poor country which is far behind England in politics and economics.

Lastly, there is a gap between the English and Indian religions.

---

1. *Passage*, p. 90.
2. Richard Martin, p. 158.
3. *Passage*, p. 56.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 242.

English people are represented as Christians like Mrs Moore; they praise God:

> [Kings] and all earthly rulers,
> princes and judges over the whole earth;
> young men and maidens,
> old men and young together.
> Let all praise the name of the Lord,
> for his name is high above all others,
> and his majesty above earth and heaven. . . . [1]

The Christians believe in an all-loving God, One who always hears their prayers and who concerns himself in their lives. On the contrary, Indians believe in various religions—for example, Aziz believes in Moslemism, while Professor Godbole, one of Aziz's acquaintances, believes in Hinduism. They are divided into too many religions to understand one another; there are so many Gods, views of life and customs that Indians can hardly understand Adela's reasoning or feel that they have "something universal in this country." The situation is really confused; therefore, Aziz insists that "[nothing] embraces the whole of India."[2] Malcolm Bradbury explains this chaos in India:

> [Indians] are themselves divided by religion and caste, above all by the gap between Moslem and Hindu. . . . But where both differ from the English is in their long and adaptive response to the confusions, which are also the mysteries, of their country, a response which obscures the firm lines of value which the British in their isolation can protect—and which permits lethargy, emotionalism, and mysticism.[3]

India is muddled because there exist various senses of values, or religions, within the country. Naturally, it is impossible for the people to standardize their ways of thinking. They cannot help being passive in the face of these confused conditions.

India is thus very distinct from England in her environment, politics, economics and religions; the differences between two countries are numerous. As a consequence of these gaps, to sensitive people

---

1. *The New English Bible: The Old Testament* (London: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 876.
2. *Passage*, p. 142.
3. Bradbury, *Possibilities*, p. 113.

such as Adela, India seems filled with muddle, chaos, and confusion, because such people, however much they try, cannot understand the country at all. Forster himself had the same feelings when he stayed in India; he wrote about his impressions of the country in *The Hill of Devi*:

> [India] is indescribable and unimaginable . . . for it is the fag end of a vanished civilisation. But my brain seems as messy as its surroundings, and I cannot realise it at all.[1]

In conclusion, India seems muddled, chaotic and confused in comparison with ordered, tidy and well-organized England.

In spite of their differences in characters and nationalities, though, Adela and Aziz sincerely want "to bridge the gulf between"[2] the two of them; Adela is eager to understand "the real India," while Aziz is anxious to make "all men his brothers." They thus go to the Marabar Caves to further their friendship, taking Mrs Moore with them.

The scenes of these caves are clearly distinct from those of the cities:

> There is something unspeakable in these [caves]. They are like nothing else in the world. . . . They rise abruptly, insanely, without . . . proportion. . . . [They] bear no relation to anything dreamt or seen.[3]

These caves are so inhuman that, as Robin Jared Lewis says, they overwhelm human beings:

> The Marabar is the *ultimate* embodiment of the insignificance of human beings in an ominous landscape that mocks their notions of self-importance. So removed are these hills from the scope of human endeavor that they stand alone and untouched. . . .[4] (Emphasis added).

Adela and Aziz have opposite impressions of these caves—Adela exclaims that they are "striking,"[5] while Aziz says that they are "so confusing."[6] Adela, a logical English woman, only admires the grand

---

1. Forster, *The Hill of Devi* (New York: A Harvest / HBJ book, 1985), p. 106.
2. *Passage*, p. 45.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
4. Robin Jared Lewis, *E. M. Forster's Passages to India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), p. 77.
5. *Passage*, p. 139.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

scenes, not noticing their chaos. On the other hand' Aziz, a spiritual Indian, senses their confusion and is bewildered.

In process of their making friends with each other, Forster has Adela and Aziz go to the Marabar Caves. That is because the caves symbolize " the spirit of the Indian earth, which tries to keep men in compartments."[1] The friendship between Adela and Aziz, or between the English and the Indians, is unachievable under the present conditions—this ultimate truth is signified by Adela's three experiences inside the cave. The first is looking at the reflection of a match, the second is hearing the echoes, and the last is having a hallucination. These experiences are natural to Aziz because he is an Indian. Although he feels uneasy when he sees these caves for the first time, he can accept them as one aspect of his own country. However, Adela cannot adapt herself to the conditions of the caves because she is an English woman.

Adela, Aziz and Mrs Moore enter one of the caves. Inside it, Aziz strikes a match:

> Immediately another flame rises in the depths of the rock and moves towards the surface like an imprisoned spirit; the walls of the circular chamber have been most marvellously polished. The two flames approach and strive to unite, but cannot, because one of them breathes air, the other stone.[2]

Adela says that the reflection of Aziz's match is " rather pretty " without realizing what it really means.[3] In reality, this reflection symbolizes the unattainable relations between Adela and Aziz; they try to be friendly with each other, but in vain, just like the two flames in the cave.

Moreover, an echo starts if they make a noise in the cave; all man-made noises become only " Boum " there:

> Whatever is said, the same monotonous noise replies, and quivers up and down the walls until it is absorbed into the roof. ' Boum ' is the sound as far as the human alphabet can express it, or ' bou-oum,' or ' ou-boum '—utterly dull.[4]

Whatever human beings say means nothing; their force is limited in

---

1. *Passage*, p. 129.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 126.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 145.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 144.

the surface of the caves. Adela cannot still comprehend that, and so she emerges from the first cave with a smile.

Leaving Mrs Moore behind, Adela and Aziz next go on to the "best" caves, or the Kawa Dol.[1] By herself, Adela enters one of the caves and has a hallucination of being insulted by Aziz. She confesses:

> I went into this detestable cave . . . and I remember scratching the wall with my fingernail, to start the usual echo, and then as I was saying there was this shadow, or sort of shadow, down the entrance tunnel, bottling me up.[2]

The enemy that attacks Adela in the cave is not Aziz but the loss of her belief that everything is comprehensible. Before coming to these caves, Adela has believed that she can understand "the real India." Through her three experiences in the caves she finally faces the fact that India is beyond her comprehension.

Adela brings an action against Aziz for assault. Now, the relations between Aziz and Adela are no longer a personal matter. Their relationship is widened to include the relationship between India and England, or, indeed, between the East and the West. Englishmen and Indians fight against each other for the sake of their races; they are each determined not to yield an inch. In the heat of this struggle, however, Adela says in the court, "I withdraw everything."[3] She honestly acts on what she believes without being influenced by the other English people. After her action, only Cyril Fielding supports her; he is also the sole Englishman who has sided with the Indians. Fielding tries to persuade Aziz not to blame Adela:

> In the course of a long talk with Miss Quested I have begun to understand her character. . . . When she saw she was wrong, she pulled herself up with a jerk and said so. I want you to realize what that means. All her friends around her, the entire British Raj pushing her forward. . . . Do treat her considerately. She really mustn't get the worst of both worlds.[4]

---

1. *Passage*, p. 145.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 182.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 210.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 229–230.

The fact that India is beyond her comprehension is what muddles Adela; therefore, she accuses Aziz by mistake. Gradually, however, she senses that the distinctions between the East and the West are inevitable. She draws a conclusion from her individual sense of values. She does her best in order to "bridge the gulf" between the East and the West, although neither Englishmen nor Indians can appreciate the reasons for her action. "Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet"; as Rudyard Kipling says, Englishmen and Indians do not try to coexist with each other under the present conditions.[1] They are eager to justify their own races.

At first Aziz hated Adela because he believed that she had ruined his prospects, but he can appreciate her bravery two years after Adela went back to England. Talking about Adela, Aziz and Fielding go for a last ride in the Mau jungle. They are very good friends. Still, their parting is inevitable:

> [The] earth didn't want it [i.e., their friendship], sending up rocks through which riders must pass single-file; the temples, the tank, the jail . . . didn't want it, they said in their hundred voices, 'No, not yet,' and the sky said, 'No, not there.'[2]

This last scene of the book implies that there are so many differences that, as Benita Parry says, "here there is no middle way to compromise and reconciliation."[3] Margaret's way of "connecting," namely, to compromise with the others, is no longer possible.

Neither Adela nor Fielding can make friends with Aziz in view of the deep gulf between India and England, or between the East and the West. Their unavoidable partings can, however, lead to "the next advance." Forster insists in his letter to a friend that even their separation is valuable:

---

1. Rudyard Kipling, "The Ballad of East and West," *Rudyard Kipling's Verse* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973), p. 234.
2. *Passage*, p. 289.
3. Benita Parry, "'A Passage to India': Epitaph or Manifesto?" *E. M. Forster: A Human Exploration*, G. K. Das and John Beer, eds. (London: The Macmillan Press, 1979), p. 133.

> [People] must go away from each other . . . every now and then, and improve themselves if the relationship is to develope or even endure. A Passage to India describes such a going away—preparatory to the next advance. . . . It seems to me that individuals progress alternately by loneliness and intimacy. . . .[1]

The repetiton of meeting and parting is, then, at least the first step toward the ideal relationship.

In this novel, Englishmen, or Westerners, are described as logical like Adela. However, they are said to lack calmness of the spirit. On the other hand, Indians, or Easterners, are described as instinctive like Aziz; they are " rooted in the soil," and have " instinctive [knowledge] which no amount of training or study can give."[2] However, their society remains rather muddled and chaotic. Both of the East and the West are valuable by themselves; however, each is incomplete as it is. F.S.C. Northrop suggests what they should do in his *The Meeting of East and West*:

> [The East and the West] can meet, not because they are saying the same thing, but because they are expressing different yet complementary things, both of which are required for an adequate and true conception of man's self and universe. Each can move into the new comprehensive world of the future, proud of its past and preserving its self-respect. Each also needs the other.[3]

Although there are ultimate differences between the East and the West, one should try to accept the other, each holding to its own values, in realizing the ideal relationship. Adela, Aziz and Fielding just start on their " passage " to such an ideal relationship.

Conclusion A Passage to the Other Man

During his life, Forster travelled abroad many times, and these ex-

---

1. Letter to Malcolm Darling, 15 September, 1924, *Selected Letters of E. M. Forster*, II, Mary Lago and P. N. Furbank, eds. (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985), p. 63.
2. Forster, " The Mind of the Indian Native State," *Abinger*, p. 363.
3. F.S.C. Northrop, *The Meeting of East and West: An Inquiry Concerning World Understanding* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946), pp. 454–455.

periences exerted much influence on his opinion of the ideal human relationship. Evelyne Hanquart makes that clear:

> [Travelling] is . . . *a move towards the Other Man*, a willingness to meet. It brings out the natural brotherhood of man and the richness of life in its diversity, and makes them enjoyable over a wider range. Thus it appears in E. M. Forster's fiction, and thus it was in his own experience from the very beginning.[1] (Emphasis added).

"A move towards the Other Man" is, indeed, the main theme of Forster's works.

Fielding says, "different people [have] different points of view"; there are always distinctions between one's character and those of others.[2] Also, all human beings have both merits and demerits. Take Mr Tytler, Henry and Adela for example; they are all logical, but each lacks spiritual perception. On the contrary, Eustace, Margaret and Aziz have a spiritual sensitivity, while they lack efficiency. Each thus has to make up for his or her weak points; "a move towards the Other Man," or Forster's ideal human relations, would enable them to become complete human beings.

Through describing impossible, compromised, and ultimate relationships, Forster presents his fears that when people face too many differences between themselves and others, they can be seized with a "panic." Forster, however, insists that they should nevertheless go on, step by step, with the "passage" to realize the desirable relationship.

In order to "bridge the gulf" between one's self and others, people have to go through three passages. The first passage is experiencing unknown senses of values, the second is having the courage to face them, and the last is affectionately accepting them.

First, people need to experience unknown senses of values. Forster writes to one of his English friends:

> [Don't] think you are wasting your time. You will never get hold of anything

---

1. Evelyne Hanquart, "E. M. Forster's Travelogue from the Hill of Devi to the Bayreuth Festival," *Human Exploration*, p. 167.
2. *Passage*, p. 286.

> in India unless you experience [India]. . . . [I insist] on seeing as much as you can.[1]

It is necessary for people to get firsthand knowledge; Adela thus wants to " see the real India."

Secondly, they must have courage to face the different ways of thinking. When people are placed in an unknown world, they can be seized with a " panic " and run away from it, as Mr Tytler flees the secluded valley. They should, however, stop and realize that there is a world beyond their understanding.

Lastly, people have to accept affectionately the distinct senses of values. Margaret, for instance, values affection in order to adapt herself to Henry. Forster also emphasizes the importance of affection in *The Hill of Devi*:

> Affection . . . was the only force to which Bapu Sahib [i.e., the Indian who is the Ruler of Dewas] responded. It did not always work, but without it nothing worked. Affection and its attendants of human warmth and instinctive courtesy —when they were present his heart awoke and dictated his actions. In their absence he could be shifty and cunning although he was never cruel.[2]

In conclusion, experience, courage, and affection are the qualities indispensable in reaching " the Other Man."

Although there are always many obstacles to humans making friends with one another, they must persevere in their " passage " to " the Other Man," toward Forster's ideal human relationship. Forster must be considered to be a writer of a definite opinion, one who is continuously asserting his belief that:

> The world . . . is a globe of men who are trying to reach one another and can best do so by the help of goodwill plus culture and intelligence. . . .[3]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Text:

Forster, E. M. *Howards End.* Vol. IV of *The Abinger Edition of E. M. Forster.* Ed. Oliver Stallybrass. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

---

1. Letter to J. R. Ackerley, 29 January, 1924, *Selected Letters*, II, p. 48.
2. Forster, *Devi*, p. 65.
3. *Passage*, p. 74.

____. *A Passage to India.* Ed. Oliver Stallybrass. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979.

____. "The Story of a Panic." *Collected Short Stories.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1954.

II. Reference Books:

A. Works of E. M. Forster:

Forster, E. M. *Abinger Harvest.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967.

____. *The Hill of Devi.* New York: A Harvest / HBJ book, 1985.

____. *Two Cheers for Democracy.* Vol. XI of *The Abinger Edition of E. M. Forster.* Ed. Oliver Stallybrass. London: Edward Arnold, 1972.

Lago, Mary and P. N. Furbank, eds. *Selected Letters of E. M. Forster.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985.

B. Other Books:

(a) Works Quoted in the Text:

Bradbury, Malcolm. *Possibilities: Essays on the State of the Novel.* London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

____. *The Social Context of Modern English Literature.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Brazini, Luigi. *The Italians.* Trans. Tetsuro Murofushi and Naoko Murofushi. Tokyo: Kohbundo, 1965.

Colmer, John. *E. M. Forster: The Personal Voice.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Das, G. K. and John Beer, eds. *E. M. Forster: A Human Exploration.* London: The Macmillan Press, 1979.

Herz, Judith Scherer and Robert K. Martin, eds. *E. M. Forster: Centenary Revaluations.* London: The Macmillan Press, 1982.

Kipling, Rudyard. "The Ballad of East and West." *Rudyard Kipling's Verse.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973.

Lewis, Robin Jared. *E. M. Forster's Passages to India.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

Martin, John Sayre. *E. M. Forster: The Endless Journey.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Martin, Richard. *The Love that Failed: Ideal and Reality in the Writings of E. M. Forster.* The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Mutahhari, Morteza. *The Human Being in the Qoran.* Trans. Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi. Ed. Somayyeh Hossainmardi. Tehran: Ministry of Islamic Guidance [1981?].

The New English Bible: The Old Testament. London: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Northrop, F.S.C. *The Meeting of East and West: An Inquiry Concerning World Understanding.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946.

"Pan." *The Oxford English Dictionary.* Vol. VII. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

World, Review of December 20, 1910. Reprinted in *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage.* Ed. Philip Gardner. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

(b) Works Consulted:

Bell, Michael, ed. *1900–1930: The Context of English Literature.* London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1980.

Cavaliero, Glen. *A Reading of E. M. Forster.* London: The Macmillan Press, 1979.

Furbank, P. N. *E. M. Forster: A Life.* Vol. II. London: Secker & Warburg, 1978.

Jeffares, A. Norman and R.L.C. Lorimer, eds. *E. M. Forster's Other Kingdom.* Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1968.

Kaneoka, Hidetomo, et al. *Religion and Scriptures in the World.* Ed. Hideki Hasegawa. Tokyo: Jiyuh Kokuminsha, 1985. (Written in Japanese).

King, Francis. *E. M. Forster and His World.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1978.

Kondoh, Ineko, ed. *E. M. Forster.* Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1967.

Okamura, Naomi. *Forster's Novels.* Tokyo: Yashio Shuppansha, 1981. (Written in Japanese).

Warner, Rex. *E. M. Forster.* Trans. Kōzō Tada. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1956.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments.* Trans. Motosuke Ogushi. Tokyo: The United Church of Christ in Japan, 1973.

(1986年度 文理学部卒業論文)